

**REMARKS**

FIGS. 1-4 have been amended.

Claims 1, 10, and 15 have been amended.

Claims 1-17 are pending and under consideration.

**I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 8, 9, 10, 14 AND 15 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY GAVRON ET AL., HOW TO USE MICROSOFT WINDOWS NT 4 WORKSTATION (ISBN #1-56276-445-4; HEREINAFTER "GAVRON":**

The present invention as recited in claim 1, for example, relates to a computer-readable recording medium recorded with a data item list display program for causing a computer to function as a list display means for displaying a plurality of data items in different display forms in a list. The display forms corresponding to respective attributes of the data items and a current condition of each of the data items, and defining respective ways of displaying the list of data items based upon the respective attributes and the current condition of each of the data items.

That is, for example, when the data item is a mail item, the mail item is displayed in a detailed format and may or may not include the contents thereof, depending upon whether the mail has been previously read or is unread (see FIGS. 13 and 27 of the specification).

Gavron discloses at section 35 of page 2, an Explorer window to manage files. The window includes a left pane for selecting a folder whose contents you want to view and a right pane or content window showing the contents of each of the folders.

However, Gavron fails to disclose "a plurality of data items in different display forms in a list, the display forms corresponding to respective attributes of the data items and a current condition of each of the data items, and defining respective ways of displaying the list of data items based upon the respective attributes and the current condition of each of the data items," as recited in amended claim 1. That is, Gavron fails to display the data items (i.e. file folders and contents thereof) differently based upon the current condition of each of the data items.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 15 patentably distinguish over Gavron. Therefore, it is

respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2 AND 3 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER GAVRON:**

As mentioned above, Gavron fails to teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1 from which claims 2 and 3 depend for the reasons mentioned above. Accordingly, Gavron fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4-7, 11-13 AND 16-17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER GAVRON IN VIEW OF SULLIVAN (US PATENT NO. 5,737,557 HEREINAFTER “SULLIVAN”):**

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Gavron fails to teach a recording medium as claimed in claim 1, wherein the program causes said list display means to add icons of different sizes corresponding to the display forms to the data items in displaying the data items. However, the Examiner asserts that Sullivan makes up for the deficiencies of Gavron. However, the Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Sullivan discloses a software suite system for implementing an intelligent window user interface for computers. Each suite includes a compound computer display object that provides a single integrated visual representation, via a software suite window for multiple application programs, documents and/or data files, which are represented in the suite window by icons (see column 3, lines 15-24). Further, the relative significance of items in the suite can be visually indicated using icons of different sizes, shapes and colors (see column 4, lines 13-15 and column 6, lines 10-13).

However, neither Gavron nor Sullivan, individually or combined, teach or suggest all of the features recited in amended claims 1 and 10 from which claims 4-7, 11-13 and 16-17 respectively depend. Therefore, Gavron in view of Sullivan fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 4-7, 11-13 and 16-17 patentably distinguish over Gavron in view of Sullivan. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**IV: CONCLUSION:**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject

matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.


Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

*November 22, 2004*

By:

  
Deidre M. Davis  
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1500